SC NAACP v. Alexander, D.S.C. Case No. 3:21-cv-03302-MGL-TJH-RMG

## Exhibit I

		Page 1
1	UNITEI	STATES DISTRICT COURT
	FOR THE I	DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
2	CC	OLUMBIA DIVISION
3		
4		
5	THE SOUTH CAROL	INA STATE CONFERENCE OF THE NAACP,
	et al.,	
6		
	Plai	intiffs,
7		
	vs. (	CASE NO.: 3:21-CV-03302-MGL-TJH-RMG
8		
	THOMAS C. ALEXAN	NDER, et al.,
9		
	Defe	endants.
10		
11		
12	DEPOSITION OF:	SENATOR LUKE A. RANKIN
		(APPEARING VIA VIRTUAL ZOOM)
13		7
14	DATE:	August 2, 2022
14	TIME:	10:52 AM
15	IIME:	10:52 AM
13	LOCATION OF	
16	THE DEPONENT:	Rankin & Rankin Law Firm
10	THE DEFORMAT.	201 Beaty Street
17		Conway, SC
18	TAKEN BY:	Counsel for the Plaintiffs
19	REPORTED BY:	TERRI L. BRUSSEAU
		(APPEARING VIA VIRTUAL ZOOM)
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
	I .	

	Page 2
1	APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:
2	ATTORNEYS FOR THE PLAINTIFFS
	THE SOUTH CAROLINA STATE CONFERENCE OF
3	THE NAACP, et al.:
4	AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION
	FOUNDATION
5	BY: SOMIL B. TRIVEDI
_	(APPEARING VIA VIRTUAL ZOOM)
6	PATRICIA YAN
_	(APPEARING VIA VIRTUAL ZOOM)
7	LILY BAGGOTT, LAW CLERK
8	(APPEARING VIA VIRTUAL ZOOM) 915 15th Street NW
0	Washington, DC 20005
9	(202) 457-0800
,	strivedi@aclu.org
10	pyan@aclu.org
11	and
12	AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION
	FOUNDATION
13	BY: ADRIEL I. CEPEDA DERIEUX
	(APPEARING VIA VIRTUAL ZOOM)
14	125 Broad Street, 18th Floor
	New York, NY 10004
15	(212) 549-2500
	acepedaderieux@aclu.org
16	
1 7	and
17	NAACD IECAI DEEENCE C EDUCATIONAI
18	NAACP LEGAL DEFENSE & EDUCATIONAL FUND, INC.
10	BY: JOHN S. CUSICK
19	(APPEARING VIA VIRTUAL ZOOM)
	LEAH C. ADEN
20	(APPEARING VIA VIRTUAL ZOOM)
	GENEVA GUADALUPE, LEGAL INTERN
21	(APPEARING VIA VIRTUAL ZOOM)
	40 Rector Street #5
22	New York, NY 10006
	(212) 965-7715
23	jcusick@naacpldf.org
	laden@naacpldf.org
24	
0.5	(Continued)
25	

	Page 3
1	ATTORNEYS FOR HOUSE DEFENDANTS, SPEAKER
	JAMES H. LUCAS, CHAIRMAN CHRIS MURPHY
2	AND CHAIRMAN WALLACE JORDAN:
3	NEXSEN PRUET, LLC
	BY: MARK C. MOORE
4	(APPEARING VIA VIRTUAL ZOOM)
	KONSTANTINE DIAMADUROS
5	(APPEARING VIA VIRTUAL ZOOM)
	1230 Main Street, Suite 700
6	Columbia, SC 29201
	(803) 253-8221
7	mmoore@nexsenpruet.com
	kdiamaduros@nexsenpruet.com
8	
	ATTORNEYS FOR ELECTION DEFENDANTS:
9	
	BURR FORMAN, LLP
10	BY: MICHAEL R. BURSTEAD
	(APPEARING VIA VIRTUAL ZOOM)
11	M. ELIZABETH CRUM
	(APPEARING VIA VIRTUAL ZOOM)
12	1221 Main Street, Suite 1800
	Columbia, SC 29201
13	(803) 799-9800
	mburstead@burr.com
14	ecrum@burr.com
15	ATTORNEYS FOR THE SENATE DEFENDANTS:
16	JONES DAY
	BY: JOHN M. GORE
17	(APPEARING VIA VIRTUAL ZOOM)
	CINDY NYGORD, PARALEGAL
18	(APPEARING VIA VIRTUAL ZOOM)
	51 Louisiana Avenue NW
19	Washington, DC 20001
	(202) 879-3939
20	jmgore@jonesday.com
21	(INDEX AT REAR OF TRANSCRIPT)
22	
23	
24	
25	

Page 4 1 SENATOR LUKE A. RANKIN 2 being first duly sworn, testified as follows: 3 **EXAMINATION** 4 BY MR. TRIVEDI: 5 Good morning, Mr. Rankin. Nice to see 0. you again. 6 7 Α. Good morning. 8 Ο. My name is Somil Trivedi. As you know, 9 I represent the plaintiffs in this suit. Even 10 though you just did for the court reporter, could 11 you please state your full name for the record, 12 spelling your last name. 13 Luke Rankin. L-U-K-E, R-A-N-K-I-N. 14 Great. For today's deposition, I just 0. 15 want to start with some basic ground rules, which 16 you probably are already familiar with, but just so 17 that we're on the same page. You understand that 18 you're testifying under oath today, is that right? 19 Α. Yes, sir. 20 Is there any reason you aren't able to 0. 21 truthfully answer my questions today? 22 Α. No. 23 Are you on any medication or anything 24 else that might inhibit your capacities or anything 25 like that?

Page 122

by. That's my only goal, so let's continue on.

Q. Okay.

MR. TRIVEDI: And, John, I'm just asking you, do you agree I've got to reserve my rights that if Senator Rankin absolutely has to go, then we'll hold this open for the remainder of the time that I need that I hope won't be the entire time allowed?

MR. GORE: Well, I don't know that we need an agreement on that because I don't think

Senator Rankin said that he has to go at a particular time. I think he's expressed that he'd like to be done at five o'clock and I think we'd all like to be done as expeditiously as possible.

So I don't think we need an agreement and we certainly don't have one at this point because I don't know what the rest of the question is going to be.

And I don't think you'd be entitled to restart the deposition, which is what I think you said before, whether there might be an entitlement to resume it subject to existing time limits.

That's something we can discuss if and when we get to that point.

MR. TRIVEDI: Okay. Great.

Page 123 1 BY MR. TRIVEDI: 2 Q. So, Senator Rankin, I have put an 3 exhibit that I have marked as Exhibit 1 into Exhibit Share. 4 5 (EXHIBIT 1, 2021 Redistricting 6 Guidelines, was marked for identification.) 7 BY MR. TRIVEDI: Are you able to see that? 8 0. 9 Not from this screen, no. You got to hit share screen or do I? 10 11 MR. TRIVEDI: It's not really a share 12 screen situation, but if you have Exhibit Share 13 through Veritext open, you ought to be able to just 14 see it. 15 Can we go off the record for a moment, 16 Madam Court Reporter? 17 COURT REPORTER: Yes. 18 (Off-the-record conference.) 19 BY MR. TRIVEDI: 20 Senator, I'm showing you what I've Q. 21 marked as Exhibit 1. Do you see that? 22 Α. I do. 23 0. Have you seen this document before? 24 Α. I have. 25 What is it? 0.

Page 124 1 That's the guidelines that we adopted Α. 2 September 17th. 3 0. Okay. And these are the guidelines governing redistricting? 4 5 Α. Correct. 6 0. Okay. I'm just going to call these the 7 guidelines going forward if that's okay. 8 Α. All right. 9 Ο. So were you involved in creating these? 10 Α. No. 11 Ο. Who was? 12 Α. Charlie and Andy, based -- and these 13 were very similar to what we had done in South 14 Carolina every ten years. 15 Q. Okay. Did you have any input in what 16 should and shouldn't be a guideline? 17 Α. Well, we voted on these, so, yeah. 18 Q. Okay. But did you have any input on 19 the draft that was considered by the committee? 20 Α. No. No. 21 That was just Andy and Will? Ο. 22 Α. No, Andy and Charlie. 23 Oh, I'm sorry about that. Andy and 0. 24 Charlie. 25 Α. I assume. Again, those would be

Page 125 1 questions to ask those two gentlemen. 2 Q. Okay. Do you know if Andy and Charlie 3 consulted with any outside lawyers? Α. Do not. 4 5 Okay. Do you know if Andy and Charlie 6 conducted any legal research before they submitted 7 this to the committee? 8 Α. Do not. 9 Did you ever ask them to to make sure 10 that you were getting the law right in here? 11 Directly, probably not. Again, Paula's 12 been involved in redistricting before. 13 attended CL -- not CLE's, but seminars on these 14 across the country. Charlie again has been either 15 a litigant or representing some party, at least 16 three of these, if not four, which may be -- seem 17 odd, but it's maybe because he's perhaps around my 18 age and so maybe -- but, anyway, he's familiar with 19 this. 20 Q. Okay. Do you know the parties that 21 Charlie's represented in redistricting litigation 22 by any chance? 23 The Senate the last time, I believe. 24 Q. Okay. He's never represented

plaintiffs in a redistricting case?

25

Page 126 1 Α. Not to my knowledge. 2 Q. Okay. You just mentioned Paula. So 3 was Paula also involved in creating these quidelines for your review in committee? 4 5 Α. She would have been consulted with Andy 6 and Paula and Charlie, I'm sure. 7 Okay. Did the guidelines include input Q. 8 from members of the public? 9 To the degree that we discussed, I 10 mean, we voted on, I would say yes, but this was 11 not a topic for public hearings, no. 12 Was the hearing at which you adopted 13 them public? 14 Α. Yeah. 15 Q. Okay. I think we covered it before, 16 but I just want to ask it again. Did you consider 17 these guidelines binding on the process? All considerations to be adhered to. 18 19 So when you say to be adhered Q. Okay. 20 to, you did not feel like you could violate a 21 quideline if you felt like it? 22 Α. They were all to be considered. 23 0. Okay. But if a map that the staff 24 proposed violated a guideline, would that be 25 grounds to not pass that now?